

REMARKS

In reply to the Election/Restriction Requirement dated March 14, 2005, the examiner has taken the position that the application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Species I (directed to Figures 1 and 4), Species II (directed to Figures 2 and 5), Species III (directed to Figure 3) and Species IV (directed to claim 23 which is not depicted in the figures).

Applicant elects Species II, and further elects the single disclosed species of reversibly connecting means shown in Figure 2 of the drawing, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The examiner has indicated that currently claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 10 are generic. However, the applicant points out that claim 10 is a dependent claim which is based on independent claim 9. Applicant believes that it is claim 9 that should be included with those claims identified as generic.


The claims that applicant believes are readable on Species II are as follows: claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21. Please note that claim 17 has been amended to correct for a lack of antecedent basis deficiency and claims 18, 21, and 22 have been amended to make said claims dependent on independent claim 17 from claim 16 which was a clerical error. Applicant realizes that claims 20 and 22 which are sought to be amended are not part of the elected claims, but requests that these claims (20 and 22) be amended before they are restricted and withdrawn, so that a clerical correction is not later required. Applicant appreciates that upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided

by 37 CFR 1.141.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the foregoing Response to Non-Compliant Amendment is fully responsive and further advances this case for examination and ultimately for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. McKenna  
Registered Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 32,368

MICHAEL R. MCKENNA  
500 West Madison Street  
Suite 3800  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
(312) 321-0123

### Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 2, 2005.

Date: 5/2/05 Signed: Ruth Zar Leeb.